

Strategy Research Project International Fellow

The Future of the Danish Army

by

Lieutenant Colonel Ken E. R. Knudsen
Danish Army



United States Army War College
Class of 2013

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT: A

Approved for Public Release
Distribution is Unlimited

COPYRIGHT STATEMENT:

The author is not an employee of the United States government.
Therefore, this document may be protected by copyright law.

This manuscript is submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Master of Strategic Studies Degree. The views expressed in this student academic research paper are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of the Army, Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government.

The U.S. Army War College is accredited by the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, 3624 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104, (215) 662-5606. The Commission on Higher Education is an institutional accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
<p>The public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing the burden, to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.</p>					
1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) xx-03-2013		2. REPORT TYPE STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT		3. DATES COVERED (From - To)	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE The Future of the Danish Army				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S) Lieutenant Colonel Ken E. R. Knudsen Danish Army				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Professor Denis C. Kaufman Department of National Security and Strategy				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army War College 122 Forbes Avenue Carlisle, PA 17013				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Distribution A: Approved for Public Release. Distribution is Unlimited.					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Word Count: 5688					
14. ABSTRACT <p>Since the end of the cold war the Danish Army has gone through considerable changes as a result of the overall shifts in Denmark's defense policy. After a decade of high intensity operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, the Danish Army may be facing a period in which it deploys no forces. At the same time the Danish parliament is increasingly focusing on the North Atlantic, where the protection of Danish territory and interests – including Greenland and the Faroe Islands – traditionally has been the role of the Danish Navy and Air Force. So what does the future for the Danish Army look like and what are the strategic choices for the Army leadership? This paper will seek to answer these questions, based on the thesis "the Danish Army will sooner or later have to give up the combined arms army as a consequence of the available resources".</p>					
15. SUBJECT TERMS Denmark, Land Force, Defense Policy, Combined Arms					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UU	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 28	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT UU	b. ABSTRACT UU	c. THIS PAGE UU			19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (Include area code)

USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

The Future of the Danish Army

by

Lieutenant Colonel Ken E. R. Knudsen
Danish Army

Professor Denis C. Kaufman
Department of National Security and Strategy
Project Adviser

This manuscript is submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Master of Strategic Studies Degree. The U.S. Army War College is accredited by the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, 3624 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104, (215) 662-5606. The Commission on Higher Education is an institutional accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation.

The views expressed in this student academic research paper are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of the Army, Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government.

U.S. Army War College
CARLISLE BARRACKS, PENNSYLVANIA 17013

Abstract

Title: The Future of the Danish Army
Report Date: March 2013
Page Count: 28
Word Count: 5688
Key Terms: Denmark, Land Force, Defense Policy, Combined Arms
Classification: Unclassified

Since the end of the cold war the Danish Army has gone through considerable changes as a result of the overall shifts in Denmark's defense policy. After a decade of high intensity operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, the Danish Army may be facing a period in which it deploys no forces. At the same time the Danish parliament is increasingly focusing on the North Atlantic, where the protection of Danish territory and interests – including Greenland and the Faroe Islands – traditionally has been the role of the Danish Navy and Air Force. So what does the future for the Danish Army look like and what are the strategic choices for the Army leadership? This paper will seek to answer these questions, based on the thesis "the Danish Army will sooner or later have to give up the combined arms army as a consequence of the available resources".

The Future of the Danish Army

Since the end of the cold war the Danish Army has gone through considerable changes as a result of the overall shifts in Denmark's defense policy. After a decade of high intensity operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, the Danish Army may be facing a period in which it deploys no forces. At the same time the Danish parliament is increasingly focusing on the North Atlantic, where the protection of Danish territory and interests – including Greenland and the Faroe Islands – traditionally has been the role of the Danish navy and Air Force.

So what does the future for the Danish Army look like and what are the strategic choices for the Army leadership? This paper will seek to answer these questions, based on the thesis “the Danish Army will sooner or later have to give up the combined arms army as a consequence of the available resources”.

Predicting the future is a tricky business. At the end of the cold war not even the most imaginative analyst dared to suggest Danish land forces would deploy to high intensity operations in Iraq and later Afghanistan within a foreseeable future. So instead of trying to predict future missions for the Danish Army, this paper will attempt to define the context in which the future development of the Danish Army will take place. In order to understand the current situation of the Danish Army this paper will start out with a study of the development of Danish defense policy and the consequences for the development of the Danish Army over the last two decades. This study will establish settings for the future development of the Danish Army and provide a basis for discussing the possibilities of developing a relevant land force for the future.

Denmark and Security Policy

The kingdom of Denmark is a small Scandinavian nation positioned at the entrance to the Baltic Sea, with a population of approximately five and a half million people and covering an area of 43,098 square kilometers, smaller than many of the individual states of the United States. The kingdom of Denmark also includes Greenland and the Faroe Islands in the North Atlantic, where Danish Navy and Air Force units traditionally enforce Danish territorial rights.

The purpose, mission and organization of Danish Defense, as stated by Law No. 122 of February 27, 2001, is to prevent conflicts and war, to ensure Denmark's sovereignty and the country's continued existence and integrity, and to promote a peaceful development in the world, with respect for human rights.¹ This law does not state anything about the size or composition of the Danish Army but merely that Danish Defense must have an army, a navy and an air force; whose size, combat power, stamina, mobility and flexibility enables the Defense to accomplish the overall mission mentioned above. The law does not spell out the role of the Army within the Defense, or define what kind of force the Danish Army is.

Throughout the Cold War, Denmark's defense policy, and the role of Danish Defense, was defined by the ability to defend Danish territory alongside NATO alliance partners. At the same time Denmark, as a natural consequence of being a co-founder of the United Nations, focused on promoting peace and stability in the world, as a relatively large contributor to UN peace-keeping and observer missions worldwide. When the Soviet Union collapsed and the Cold War ended, Denmark suddenly found itself in a new geopolitical position characterized by "no conventional military threat towards Denmark within the next decade" as stated by the Defense Commission in

1997.² This new situation allowed Denmark to refocus its Defense policy from defense of its territory against a possible Soviet invasion to a more expeditionary course of deploying forces to promote peace and stability around the globe. As a result, Danish defense policy has changed considerably since 1991, resulting in dramatic changes within all services. To better understand the current status and environment for the Danish Army the following part of the paper will look at the recent changes in – and consequences for – both the Danish Army and its sister services.

The Development of Danish Defense Policy

The detailed development of Danish defense is defined in so called Defense Agreements. A Defense Agreement is a political agreement between a number of political parties representing a majority in the Danish parliament on the development of the armed forces. These agreements normally cover a 5 year period and lay out the general development of and the budget for Danish Defense within the period. To understand the development of the Danish Army from the end of the cold war to present, it is worth studying the general outlines of these defense agreements.

In the spring of 1992 Denmark deployed a battalion to Croatia and, later that same year, a company to Bosnia. The deployed units were from a Defense force with a cold war organizational legacy. It was an organization with a relatively large mobilization force and a relatively small standing force. This force was characterized by a relatively large number of vehicles and other main equipment, but to some degree old and more or less obsolete. Throughout the nineties it became apparent that this organization was not suited for the new role for Danish Defense.

The first major reorganization appeared with *Defense Agreement 2000 – 2004* that stated that "the changed security situation allows for significant restructuring of

Danish defense”.³ This development provided an opportunity to make reductions in the armed forces capacity to defend Danish territory. Although the agreement stated that “The Danish Defense must continue to be able to make a credible contribution to NATO if there should arise a threat against the Alliance”, the clear focus was on strengthening Danish Defense capacity for international operations. The direct consequences of this agreement for the Danish Army was a reduction of the mobilization force, including the dismantling of several local defense battalions and one entire brigade still allowing the army to mobilize a division and two separate brigades in case of a threat against Danish territory. For the Navy this agreement included the dismantling of the fleet of small and fast missile attack boats and two minelayers and the acquisition of two larger ocean going vessels, as the first step of transforming the Danish Navy from a littoral force to a more expeditionary maritime force. For the Air Force the agreement included investing in new C-130 aircraft and a reduction of F-16 squadrons. With this Defense Agreement Denmark entered the new millennium with a battalion deployed to Kosovo and a battalion in Bosnia, and with naval vessels and fighter jets supporting the operations in the Balkans.

This situation was soon to change after terrorists attacked the United States on September 11, 2001, and changed the global situation dramatically. The Danish government almost instantly decided to send special forces and fighter air craft to support US led operations in Afghanistan. In 2003 Denmark supported the US led invasion of Iraq, initially with naval forces, and in 2004 the Danish Army deployed a combat battalion as a part of the occupation force in Iraq, which resulted in the Danish Army engaging in high intensity combat operations for the first time in the modern age.

This led to two major changes for the Danish Army. First of all, the obvious necessity of procuring new and costly equipment to improve the protection of the deployed forces in high intensity operations. Secondly, the need for adapting the army organization to sustaining forces in the new reality of international operations.

As a consequence *Defense Agreement 2005 – 2009* reorganized the Danish Defense substantially in order to provide increased operational capabilities and free resources to enable the Danish Defense to establish and deploy forces in demanding high intensity international operations together with allies, and maintain deployed capabilities corresponding to approximately 2,000 personnel (1,500 from the Army and 500 from the Navy and the Air Force).⁴ This reorganization included termination of the Mobilization Army, including the reserve forces, leaving the Danish Army with two brigades and a division headquarters. One of the brigades was a fully manned armored brigade with regular soldiers, and the second brigade was a headquarters for training conscripts and short term volunteers for international operations.

The decision to continue conscription, while at the same time getting rid of the mobilization defense and the Army Reserve, requires some further explanation. The main reason for keeping the draft was to maintain the wide recruiting base from the mobilization army. A new system of short-term conscription was implemented to recruit voluntary soldiers to complete the army's new reaction force training following their 4 months of general training. The new reaction force training allowed the army to deploy a voluntary force up to battalion size with one year of military training alongside the regular forces of the army. This model should turn out to be a key component in sustaining forces for the Danish Army's international operations in the coming years.

For the sister services *Defense Agreement 2004 – 2009* brought dramatic changes. The Navy lost its submarines and it was furthermore decided to replace three smaller coastal frigates with three modern ocean going frigates, while the Air Force lost its ground based air defense and the number of operational fighter aircraft was reduced to 48 operational F-16 aircraft organized into two squadrons.

During the period of this defense agreement the Danish Battalion in Iraq was redeployed from Iraq to Helmand, Afghanistan. In 2007 "The Danish Battle Group", joining the United Kingdom Task Force Helmand, in Regional Command South west (RC(SW)), consisted of a reinforced battalion headquarters, two mechanized infantry companies, a tank platoon, a platoon, an mechanized engineer company and a logistic company. The "Danish Battle Group" also included two British infantry companies and a British reconnaissance squadron, due to the limited number of Danish infantry companies compared to the British battalion Battle groups in Task Force Helmand. Furthermore, the Danish Battle Group depended on army aviation, fire support and Intelligence, Surveillance, Target Acquisition, and Reconnaissance (ISTAR) assets from Task Force Helmand and other allies.⁵

Another important development in Danish foreign and defense policy was introduced with the *Danish Helmand Plan 2011 – 2012*.⁶ The Danish parliament decided to change Denmark's contribution to Afghanistan, from focusing on high intensity counter insurgency operations to training Afghan security forces. As a part of this plan the "Danish Battle Group" was terminated in February 2012 and the remaining mechanized infantry company and tank platoon was attached to a British battalion battle group. It is important to note that the downsizing and initial withdrawal from Afghanistan

happened prior to similar decisions from key allies such as the United Kingdom and the United States.

Defense Agreement 2010 – 2014 brought dramatic changes to the army. The following quote is quite clear on the political emphasis on the army adapting to the consequences of deploying combined arms battalion battle groups to international missions:

The experience from the army's deployments in international operations has shown that the army deploys combined arms battalions – so called battalion battle groups. The army's operational structure, however, has so far not sufficiently reflected this ... there is consensus that the army's operational structure should focus on the battalion battle group In addition to the ability to deploy battalion battle groups the Army must maintain a capacity to form a unit of brigade size after a longer period of preparation. Combat support units and support units must be modular and fit into the battalion battle group framework. The army maintains a fire support capacity for international operations.⁷

As a consequence the army was reorganized into six smaller “battalion battle groups” able to deploy on international operations on a rotation basis, with the brigade reduced to being a headquarters without the previous organic combat support and support units. At the same time the number of tanks in the army was reduced from 57 to 34 while the army's air defense and anti tank missile units were closed. Furthermore, it was decided to replace the obsolete M109 self propelled howitzers. For the sister services, this defense agreement included the acquisition of new helicopters for the Navy and reduced the number of operational fighter aircraft In the Royal Danish Air Force from 48 to 30. It is worth noting, that *Defense Agreement 2010 – 2014* was the first to recognize the need for substituting the huge amount of equipment lost and worn out during the demanding operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. As a consequence the agreement included the first increase of the defense budget in recent history.

Unfortunately, recent economical developments demanded a cut in the overall spending of the Danish government including the armed forces. As a consequence *Defense Agreement 2010 – 2014* was replaced by *Defense Agreement 2013 – 2017* including an overall decrease of the defense budget by approximately 15 percent.⁸ The direct implications for the Danish Army do not seem to be dramatic, since the numbers of soldiers are almost status quo and the changes for the army is the transformation from six smaller combat battalions to three stronger combat battalions and the reorganization of army special forces as a part of a new Joint Special Forces Command. But at the same time the agreement includes decisions that might indicate the future priority of the army in the overall development of Danish defense. First of all the agreement emphasizes the increased focus in the North Atlantic, and reinforces this with the decision on investing in an additional inspection frigate for the Navy for the North Atlantic. Furthermore, the agreement states the need for a decision in 2015 on what type of aircraft will replace the current fleet of F-16's in the Air Force.

The Struggle for Resources

So, what's the situation for the Danish Army at the beginning of 2013? First of all, the ongoing withdrawal of Danish Army forces from Afghanistan could mark the end of an era of deploying battalion battle groups to high intensity operations. In particular, the unilateral Danish decision on reducing combat forces in Afghanistan prior to our key allies may indicate a decreasing appetite for high intensity land operations within the Danish parliament. If this is the case, the Danish Army will find itself competing for resources in a future where "Denmark needs to maintain maritime and airborne capabilities to perform tasks in relation to enforcement of sovereignty, in relation to the

Arctic areas where a higher activity as a result of climate change will transform the region's geostrategic dynamics and importance".⁹

The overall definition of the available resources to Danish Defense is the defense budget. And since the Danish Army does not have its own budget for personnel and equipment it is worth taking a look at the overall premises for future army resources. Even during the cold war, the Danish defense budget was considerably under the NATO requirement for 2 percent¹⁰ of gross domestic product and over the years it has decreased to 1.4 percent in 2011.¹¹ With the latest defense budget cuts it is obviously even less. In real money the annual defense budget has been very constant since 2001 with a slight increase of 3.5 percent in *Defense Agreement 2010 – 2014* and the 15 percent reduction in *Defense Agreement 2013 – 2015*, leaving the defense budget some 10 percent under the previous budget.

Generally speaking, more than half of the Defense budget is spent on paying personnel. Less than 15 percent of the budget is for acquisition of equipment for all services.¹² Basically, the available resources for the future Danish Army can be broken down to personnel numbers and the budget for acquisition of equipment. On the personnel side, the latest cuts in military spending did not affect the army numbers significantly, and the current strength of the army is a little more than 8,000 regulars and a variable number of short term soldiers, recruited among the 4,200 annual conscripts. Further cuts in the defense budget will likely affect the numbers of the army, but since there is a direct relation between the size of the army and the size of the force it can deploy and sustain, further personnel cuts will likely lead to an adjustment of the mission for the army.

The equipment part of the budget could be a much more serious challenge for the Danish Army. With a very limited acquisition budget for Danish Defense, the current trend of investing in maritime capacity and the upcoming decision on new fighter aircraft to replace the fleet of F-16's, could be a serious challenge even without further cuts in the defense budget. And where salaries are relatively stable, following the general development in prices, modern army equipment becomes relatively more expensive over the years. To simplify matters, you can keep the same number of soldiers in a constant budget, but you are probably not able to replace equipment over time.

The Current Situation of the Danish Army

So far the Danish Army has been able to hold on to most of the capabilities from the armored brigades of the past, where the Navy and Air Force have been forced to give up significant parts of their previous capacities, such as submarines and ground based air defense. As a result, the present Danish Army is a relatively heavy land force that is more or less able to operate without support from other nations.

Despite the loss of air defense and anti tank missile units, the Danish Army has been able to hold on to tanks, modern infantry fighting vehicles, artillery and heavy engineer equipment allowing the army to train and operate as an combined arms capable land force. And even though the primary brigade of the army have been deprived of its combat support and support units, these units are still organized in the same battalions and subunits as in the previous organization of the armored brigade. So, basically the Danish Army can reestablish the armored brigade over time.

The result of maintaining the units from the armored brigade, within the framework of a relatively small army, has been that each type of unit can only exist in very limited numbers. As an example there are only 30 operational tanks and one

operational artillery battery left in the organization. At the same time it is worth mentioning that the need for combat support and support units to support the current structure of relatively heavy equipped combat forces has left only six regular infantry companies within the entire army structure.

An example of the consequences of this organization is the Danish Battle Group in Task Force Helmand, Afghanistan, where the Danish Army was able to deploy a relatively heavy equipped force, but lacked the numbers to form a battle group with sufficient maneuver units. Subsequently, the British Army provided two infantry companies and a reconnaissance squadron to the “Danish Battle Group” to enable it to operate as a ground holding battle group. The deployment of heavy equipment such as tanks and modern infantry fighting vehicles turned out to be quite a success for the Danish Army, not least because the British Task Force Helmand was a relatively light force that was more than happy to be supported by heavier Danish capabilities in some of the combat operations. At the same time the Danish Army was forced to adapt to the increasing threat from Improvised Explosive Devices (IED's) by investing in new armored logistics vehicles and by leasing forty Mine Resistant Ambush Protected (MRAP) vehicles from the United States Marine Corps to supplement the heavier fighting vehicles with less protection against IED's.

As recognized in *Defense Agreement 2010 – 2014*, the Danish Army has lost a considerable amount of equipment during the deployments to Iraq and Afghanistan. As a consequence there is an urgent need to reinvest in armored vehicles. The Danish Army is in the process of procuring approximately 100 new armored personnel carriers – as a part of the Defense Acquisition Plan – in order to replace a number of the lost or

worn down M113 and Piranha type vehicles. At the same time the army is looking for a fire support system to replace the M109 self propelled howitzers in the remaining artillery battalion.

The Future of the Danish Army

From the study of the recent development in Danish defense policy, it seems unlikely that the overall mission and size of the Danish Army will change dramatically within a foreseeable future. The most significant change in the latest defense agreements has been the demand to focus the army organization on the battalion battle group and the change of the previous requirement of being able to deploy a brigade to the ability of forming a “brigade size unit” over time. But what is a battalion battle group and what is the difference between a Brigade and a “brigade size unit”?

The battalion battle group is designed to operate independently, where the traditional battalion is organized to operate within the framework of a brigade. As a consequence, the battalion battle group include capabilities that traditionally belong at higher levels of command; for example fire support, combat engineers, military police, reconnaissance units, ISTAR capacities and logistic units. In the Danish definition, the brigade is the maneuvering force that supports the battalions with artillery, engineers, and military police. Hence, the need for brigade artillery, brigade engineers and so forth. The choice of the term “brigade size unit” is therefore a way of describing a unit of a certain size, not necessarily being a brigade. A “brigade size unit” could consist of three battalion battle groups organized under a brigade headquarters, with everything but the brigade headquarters organized within the battalion battle groups.

With the latest defense agreement, the Danish Army must continue to be prepared to participate in the full spectrum of operations, and be ready to deploy - and

sustain - a battalion battle group of up to 800 soldiers to missions all over the world, and at the same time maintain a capacity to form a unit of brigade size after a longer period of preparation. However, the aim and purpose of being able to form a brigade size unit is not clear. The use of “form” and not “deploy” could indicate that the brigade size capacity does not relate to international deployments but merely national operations.

Another weakness of the current mission statement is the lack of a definition of what kind of enemy the army must be able to fight – and defeat. Even though the term “full spectrum of operations” would seem to include high intensity combat operations it does not say anything about the capacity to fight an armored opponent.

Both the mission of deploying and sustaining a battalion battle group of up to 800 soldiers and mission of establishing a brigade size unit over time seem achievable within the current size of a little more than 8000 regulars and a flexible number of short term soldiers. With the latest adjustments, including reorganizing the current six battalion battle groups into three stronger battalion battle groups, the Danish Army is focused on the ability to deploy a battalion battle group with short notice and over time adjust the production of reaction forces in order to sustain this battle group. At the same time establishing stronger battalion battle groups will create a better training environment than in the current smaller battalion battle groups and over time these three battalion battle groups could form a brigade sized unit. So, basically the Danish Army is ready for the future. Or is it?

First of all, being able to deploy and sustain a battle group of 800 soldiers does not say much about the kind of army need of army you need. If we look at the British battle groups working alongside the Danish battle group in Helmand, Afghanistan, these

were basically light infantry units. For the counter insurgency operations of the later years, it would seem that a lighter force could be an alternative to the Danish Army of today. But for combat operations against an armored opponent, a lighter force could be problematic.

Secondly, the ability to form a brigade size unit over time does not seem to be rooted in any scenario, since the role of the Danish Army in protecting the home land is not defined at all.

Therefore, the future organization of the Danish Army must first and foremost focus on the ability to deploy a battalion battle group of up to 800 soldiers. In the case of The Danish Battle Group in Afghanistan, it would not make sense to expand the force from 650 to 800 Danish soldiers without deploying an additional infantry company. Since this third company is not sustainable within the current number of infantry companies of the Danish Army, being able to sustaining three infantry companies should be the basis for the future organization of the Danish Army. This essentially means reducing or removing existing capabilities, but how can that be done within a current structure already under pressure?

A way ahead could be to identify what capabilities are relevant for a small nation to bring to a multinational operation. It is hard to imagine the Danish Army deploying to a high intensity international operation without being attached to a parent unit from a bigger nation like the United Kingdom, France or the United States of America. These nations will be able to provide combat support traditionally belonging at the brigade level or at higher levels of command. In the example of the Danish Battle Group in Afghanistan the British parent unit, UK Task Force Helmand, was able to deliver artillery

support, heavy engineer support, ISTAR capabilities, army aviation and a field hospital. Based on this, it is clear that what really matters is delivering a battalion battle group headquarters and “boots on the ground” in the shape of ground holding companies and other maneuver units.

Another area of interest is logistics, where the current army organization includes almost as many logistic soldiers as combat soldiers. One of the main reasons for this unfortunate balance is the huge demand for logistic support to units deployed to remote places. Another reason is the fact that a force with heavy equipment needs relatively more logistical resources for maintenance and supplies than a lighter equipped force. Hence, transforming into a generally lighter land force should enable the Danish Army to reduce the number of logistics and increase the numbers of combat forces.

Based on the discussion on resources, the overall size of the Danish Army is not likely to change dramatically in a foreseeable future. Even if the army is reduced in numbers, it would simply make it relatively easier to maintain the necessary amount of modern and relevant equipment. Therefore, the main future challenge for the Danish Army would seem to be how to equip a force of the present size with relevant modern equipment in the likely scenario of limited resources for acquisition.

With a current fleet of approximately forty relatively new and modern CV 9035 infantry fighting vehicles and the ongoing acquisition of approximately hundred new armored personnel carriers, these armored vehicles will likely be the back bone of the Danish Army in a foreseeable future. With limited resources for acquisition, it would seem likely that the current fleet of main battle tanks, heavy engineer and recovery vehicles and self propelled artillery will not be replaced at the end of their life cycles. An

example is the current fleet of Leopard 1A5 main battle tanks that has served the army well in Afghanistan. These vehicles, together with the fleet of heavy engineer and recovery vehicles, will probably be able to operate for another decade or two, but will probably not be replaced when they are worn down. As a consequence, the Danish Army will inevitably have to transform into a lighter force over time.

Another strategic choice is the type of land force the Danish Army should be in the future. The present Danish Army is a relatively heavy combined arms force, where the availability of tanks, heavy infantry fighting vehicles, and heavy engineer and recovery vehicles make the Danish Army capable of deploying forces is the flexibility to participate in any kind of land operation. From a logistical perspective, a heavy force is not only more expensive in peace time, but even more expensive to deploy and requires relatively more logistical support for resupplying and maintenance, than a relatively lighter force. Furthermore, it requires heavy engineer equipment for mobility and heavy recovery capacity. So, choosing a generally lighter force will principally facilitate the reduction of the size of logistic and engineer units, enabling the rebalancing of the Danish Army towards more infantry capacity.

The Strategic Choices

It seems clear that the Danish Army will have to adjust in order to be able to sustain a battalion battle group of 800 soldiers. It also seems obvious that the Danish Army, sooner or later, will have to transform into a lighter force, as a consequence of the inability to pay for the replacement of some of the existing heavy equipment. So, the real strategic choice for the Danish Army is probably not *whether* it should transform into a lighter land force, but *when* and *how* to transform.

In the likely scenario of no Danish Army deployments in a foreseeable future, there would seem to be good arguments for delaying this transformation. First of all, the current organization of the Danish Army enables the deployment of a battalion battle group of up to 800 soldiers to the full spectrum of operations, where a lighter force may not be able to participate in operations against an armored opponent. So by maintaining the present heavy capacities for as long as possible, the Danish Army will remain a more flexible tool for the Danish government in the likely future of no larger land forces deployed. At the same time, the inability of the current organization to sustain three infantry companies will have to be overcome by reorganizing the army after the decision to deploy a battalion battle group to an international operation has been made.

Secondly, the current organization provides the Danish Army with a national framework for training in a combined arms environment with a combination of heavy and light capacities. Transforming the army to a light force will require support from – and cooperation with – partner nations in order to conduct combined arms training.

Thirdly, transforming into a lighter force will require investment in new vehicles. The case of leasing MRAP vehicles in Afghanistan shows how difficult it is to predict what type of vehicles will be required five or ten years from now. As a consequence the vehicle type bought today may be obsolete when the next deployment comes. So, by delaying the transformation, the risk of buying the wrong equipment can at least be reduced.

Last, but maybe not least, delaying the likely transformation to a lighter land force will at the same time preserve the most flexible land force for as long as possible. Even though the official Danish policy is based on ruling out any threats towards Danish

territory within the next decade, not even experts can predict the future. And by maintaining the full spectrum capable army for as long as possible, the Army will be best prepared for any eventuality in the future. This may well be “stewardship of the army”, but since it is not in conflict with the political directions for the Danish Army, it is worth considering.

Conclusion

Over time, the Danish Army will likely be forced to give up the heavy capacities of the current organization and transform into a lighter force, as a simple consequence of the lack of resources for equipment in the foreseeable future. In order to be a relevant land force of the future, the Army will at the same time have to increase the ability to sustain more infantry companies, in order to deliver “feet on the ground” which will be at the expense of some of the current capacities of tank units, engineer units, and not least logistic units.

In order to be the most flexible land force for the immediate future, including the capacity to fight an armored land force, it seems relevant to maintain the current heavy capacities of the Danish Army until the situation demands otherwise. An upcoming deployment of a battalion battle group of 800 soldiers – and not least the sustainment of this – or the end of the life cycle of the current heavy capacities, will force the Danish Army to reorganize to a lighter force. At the same time it is obvious, that future acquisition of vehicles and equipment will have to be aimed at the future “light army”. An example of this is the coming fire support system for the Army that must fit into the operational requirements of the light battalion battle group.

So, even though the Danish Army will have to prepare for transforming into a lighter land force, with less heavy equipment and more infantry capacity, it would seem wise not to rush into a transformation.

Endnotes

¹ The Kingdom of Denmark, *law No. 122 of February 27, 2001*, Copenhagen 2001.
<https://www.retsinformation.dk/Forms/R0710.aspx?id=6294&exp=1>

² Danish Ministry of Defense, *Report from the Danish Defense Commission 1997*, p. 21
<http://www.fmn.dk/videnom/Documents/Hovedbind%2020FKOM%201997%20beretning.pdf>

³ Danish Ministry of Defense, *Defense Agreement 2000 – 2004*, Copenhagen, June 1999
<http://www.fmn.dk/videnom/Pages/Tidligereforsvarsforlig.aspx>

⁴ Danish Ministry of Defense, *Defense Agreement 2005 – 2009*, Copenhagen, June 2004
http://www.fmn.dk/SiteCollectionDocuments/FMN/Forsvarsforlig%202005%202009/forlig04_forligstekst.pdf

⁵ Details regarding the Danish Battle Group in Afghanistan are from the authors experience as Commanding Officer, Danish Battle Group, Task Force Helmand, Regional Command South West, ISAF, Afghanistan, from August 2011 to February 2012.

⁶ Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Danish Ministry of Defense, *The Helmand Plan 2011 – 2012*, Copenhagen 2010.
http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=helmand%20planen%202012&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&ved=0CDIQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.fmn.dk%2Ftemaer%2Fafghanistan%2Fbaggrundforindsatsen%2FDocuments%2FHelmandplan2011_FINAL_web.pdf&ei=JXwaUdKzAdDIOAH_pIGwAQ&usq=AFQjCNGqXFtviLPkWGuzk6706Br05FJUrq&bvm=bv.42261806,d.dmQ

⁷ Danish Ministry of Defense, *Defense Agreement 2010 – 2014*, Copenhagen, June 2009
http://www.fmn.dk/videnom/Pages/Forsvarsforliget2010_2014.aspx

⁸ Danish Ministry of Defense, *Defense Agreement 2013 – 2017*, Copenhagen, November 2012
<http://www.fmn.dk/videnom/Pages/Forsvarsforliget2013-2017.aspx>

⁹ Danish Ministry of Defense, *Report from the Danish Defense Commission 2008*, Copenhagen 2008, p. 98
<http://www.fmn.dk/videnom/Documents/Hovedbind%20%E2%80%93%20FKOM%202008%20beretning.pdf>

¹⁰ NATO Press Release: *Financial and Economic Data Relating to NATO Defence*, April 12, 2012. http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/news_85966.htm?mode=pressrelease

¹¹ Danish Ministry of Defense, *The development of the defense budget in Denmark*, http://www.fmn.dk/nyheder/Documents/Faktaark_2020_Forsvarsministeriet.pdf

¹² Danish Ministry of Defense, *Economy of the Ministry*, Copenhagen 2012
<http://www.fmn.dk/videnom/Pages/Ministeromraadetsoekonomi.aspx>